UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,808	04/26/2005	Yoram Palti	P-5488-US	8892

49443 7590 10/24/2008

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway
12th Floor
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER	
SINGH, SATYENDRA K	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1657	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/532,808	PALTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SATYENDRA K. SINGH	1657	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *22-25,30-33 and 36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *22-25,30-33 and 36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 April 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/21/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response (and amendments to the pending claims) filed on July 21st 2008 is duly acknowledged.

Claims 1-21 and 26-29 are canceled. Claims 34 and 35 have been canceled by applicant's current amendments to the claims.

Claims 22-25, 30-33 and 36 (applicant's elected invention of **Group III**), as currently amended, are examined on their merits in this office action.

The following contains new grounds of rejection necessitated by applicant's amendments to claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names **joint inventors**. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 22-25, 30-33 and 36 (as currently amended) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall (US 6,228,605 B1; IDS) in view of Iddan et al (US 5,604,531; IDS) and Leppaniemi et al (1996; [U]).

> Instant claims are generally directed to **a method for *in vivo* detection of *H. pylori*** comprising: inserting an autonomous *in vivo* sensing device into an upper gastrointestinal tract of a patient; causing the autonomous *in vivo* device to contact at least one location of the upper gastrointestinal tract **by rotating said patient**; sensing pH in at the location in of the upper gastrointestinal tract using said autonomous *in vivo* device; processing pH data sensed to determine presence of *H. pylori*; and transmitting pH data (by radio frequency) to an external receiving unit. (see also recitations of amended claims 23-25, 30-33 and 36)

Marshall (IDS) discloses a method for *in vivo* detection of *H. pylori* comprising inserting an autonomous *in vivo* sensing device (an endoscope; see abstract, figure 1, and summary of the invention, columns 3-6, in particular) into an upper gastrointestinal tract; sensing pH in at least one location in the upper gastrointestinal tract using said endoscope; and transmitting pH data visually through said endoscope to an external receiving unit (the viewer, for example); wherein the method further comprising indicating a pH value which is about equal to or exceeds a predetermined threshold; wherein sensing pH is by imaging (i.e. visual determination taken as imaging) a color changing pH indicator; the method according to claim 23, wherein the pH value is about 5.5 (see use of pH indicators such as bromothymol blue and phenol red; column columns 3-6, in particular). The method further comprising visually imaging the gastrointestinal tract using said endoscope, wherein the step of transmitting pH data further comprises transmitting image data (i.e. visual inspection/transmission through an endoscope); the method further comprising ingesting urea prior to inserting the endoscope (see column6, 3rd paragraph, in

particular); the method further comprising the step of causing the endoscope to contact at least one location of a stomach mucus by positioning a patient to achieve substantial covering of the patient's stomach (see taken as inherent in the method for *in vivo* detection of *H. pylori* using an endoscope, urea and pH indicators, as explicitly disclosed by Marshall on columns 3-6, and claims, in particular; see also, the 112-second rejection above)

However, the method according to claim 22, wherein the device (used to sense and collect the pH data using pH indicators that change color above about pH 5.5) is an "**autonomous *in vivo* sensing device**", wherein the transmitting is done **by radio frequency**, and wherein the method is performed by "causing the autonomous *in vivo* device to contact at least one location of the upper gastrointestinal tract by **rotating said patient**", is not explicitly disclosed by the invention of Marshall.

Iddan et al (IDS) disclose an **autonomous video endoscope** that includes a swallowable capsule (including a camera system and an optical system for imaging an area of interest such as upper GI tract), a transmitter and a reception system, wherein the transmitter transmits the video output of the camera system and the reception system receives the transmitted video output using radio frequency (see Iddan et al, abstract, figure 1, 3B, and 5; column 1 and 3; and summary of the invention, in particular).

Leppaniemi et al [U] disclose the concept of rotating a patient during diagnostic laparoscopic medical procedures (commonly used in the art; see page 486, section on "Technique", and page 487, left column, 2nd paragraph, in particular) that typically use a videolaparoscope (akin to *in vivo* sensing device), and employ such method steps as "**rotating the patient**" during the laparoscopic examination in order to gain full view for a systematic and thorough examination of the internal organs, albeit using a wired probe i.e. 10 mm, 30 degree laparoscope. Thus, the concept of a diagnostic method comprising the method step of "rotating the patient" for gaining full access and view of the internal organs enclosed within a chamber

(such as peritoneal cavity, etc.) when using an imaging device, is fully disclosed by Leppaniemi et al.

Thus, given the detailed disclosure for a method for *in vivo* detection of *H. pylori* in a patient or subject as disclosed by Marshall, at the time this invention was made, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Marshall by 1) replacing or substituting the endoscope (i.e. the device) used by Marshall with a better device (i.e. a better functional analogue) disclosed by Iddan et al that works autonomously (by incorporating suitable CCD camera and optical systems) using radio frequency to receive and transmit image signal as explicitly disclosed by the invention of Iddan et al (see Iddan et al, column 1, in particular), and 2) by incorporating the method step of "rotating the patient" such that it intrinsically causes said autonomous device to "contact at least one location of the upper gastrointestinal tract", as explicitly suggested and disclosed by Leppaniemi et al, albeit for a conceptually similar diagnostic procedure using a videolaparoscope to examine and image damaged abdominal or internal organs within peritoneal cavity of a patient in need of such examination.

A person of ordinary skill in the clinical art would have been motivated to upgrade the method of Marshall as 1) Iddan et al disclose the potential benefits (i.e. the flexibility to move in the body cavities by its own weight , option of imaging the entire digestive tract and hard to reach parts without discomfort associated with older endoscopes; see Iddan et al, column 1, Background of the Invention, in particular) of using such independent devices that can be contained in a capsule, and that have all the required components to provide the capability of sensing internal pH, acquiring pH data using the color change in the form of an image data, and

storing and transmitting said data using RF signals, wherein the data can be further correlated with the presence and/or absence of the microbe, *H. pylori* as explicitly disclosed by Marshall's invention; and 2) Leppaniemi et al provide direct suggestions of incorporating a method step such as "rotating the patient" (i.e. "repositioning manoeuvres"; see page 487, left column, 2nd paragraph, in particular) at various angles and/or positions in order to provide systematic and comprehensive imaging and thus thorough examination of the cavity or chamber such as intraperitoneal cavity and its contents. Since, the autonomous *in vivo* sensing device as disclosed by Iddan et al would necessarily follow the route of being in contact with "at least one location" of the upper GI tract by such repositioning of said patient, one of ordinary skill in the clinical art would be motivated to incorporate such method step in the diagnostic procedure, especially where a "autonomous" probe or sensor is being used (i.e. no direct contact option exists for moving a wireless device, once ingested in the internal chamber such as stomach, for example; and where the indirect options may only include an external force such as magnetic, etc. or the option of changing the position of the subject itself to provide different angles and thus moving the autonomous sensing device due to its own weight to a different location within the body cavity, such as stomach).

Therefore, it is Examiner's position that such beneficial modifications would have been clearly within the perception of an artisan of ordinary skill in the clinical art, and the artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success when modifying the method of Marshall, and using such autonomous device (in place of older endoscopes that could not function independently) as Iddan et al clearly provide use for such an autonomous video endoscope (see figure 6, and summary of the Invention, in particular); and as Leppaniemi et al disclose the fact

that rotating the patient at different angles and/or positions provides full view, thorough imaging and examination of an internal cavity and its contents, as exemplified by the use of such method step during diagnostic laparoscopy. Since, the benefits accrued by incorporating such modifications in the method of Marshall would have been fully contemplated by an artisan of ordinary skill in the medical art at the time this invention was made, in view of the combined teachings of Iddan et al and Leppaniemi et al, the invention as claimed fails to distinguish it self over the cited prior art references of record, and is therefore, considered obvious.

Thus, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the clinical art at the time the claimed invention was made.

As per MPEP 2144.06, In order to rely on equivalence as a rationale supporting an obviousness rejection, the equivalency must be recognized in the prior art, and cannot be based on applicant's disclosure or the mere fact that the components at issue are functional or mechanical equivalents. In re Ruff, 256 F.2d 590, 118 USPQ 340 (CCPA 1958).

As per MPEP 2111.01, during examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, F.3d, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004)(The USPTO uses a different standard for construing claims than that used by district courts; during examination the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation.). This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification. In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Nonstatutory Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 22-25, 30-33 and 36 are/remain provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-21 of copending Application No. 10/524,553 (common inventor, same assignee). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims in said co-pending application are also directed to a similar subject matter as follows:

> "A method for in vivo analysis, the method comprising the steps of: obtaining a sample from a body lumen; combining in vivo the sample with agglutinative particles; and detecting at least one optical change in the combined sample."

Since, the disclosure of co-pending application specifically states that "*the agglutinated particles may include cells, such as bacteria (e.g. H. pylori)*" (see co-pending application, page 4, paragraph [0034], in particular), the two sets of claims are clearly co-extensive in scope, and therefore, a obviousness-type double patenting rejection is required.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on July 21st 2008 (as they pertain to pending claims 22-25, 30-33 and 36 over the cited prior art references of record) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons of record. Applicants argue the following (see remarks, pages 5-6, in particular):

> Applicants note that independent claim 22 has been amended inter alia to include the step of "causing the autonomous in vivo device to contact at least one location of the upper gastrointestinal tract by rotating said patient". Applicants note that neither Marshall nor Iddan discloses or suggests the step of causing the autonomous in vivo device to contact at least one location of the upper gastrointestinal tract by rotating the patient. Accordingly, claim 22 is not obvious over Marshall in view of Iddan."

In response, it is noted that the obviousness rejection of record, as discussed above (Marshall in view of Iddan et al and Leppaniemi et al) discloses the fact that such method steps as "causing the autonomous in vivo device to contact at least one location of the upper gastrointestinal tract by rotating said patient" would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary

skill in the medical art, especially in view of the disclosure provided by Leppaniemi et al (as discussed above) and when combined with the teachings of Marshall and Iddan et al that explicitly disclose the method for *in vivo* detection of *H. pylori* in a patient in need thereof using an autonomous *in vivo* sensing device to image, detect and transmit the pH of stomach as currently being claimed in the instant invention. The obviousness rejection of record is therefore, properly made and maintained.

Regarding the ODP rejection record, since applicants have deferred a response at the present time till an allowable subject matter is identified through prosecution (see remarks, page 6), and since, no terminal disclaimer or a pertinent argument has been provided, the rejection of record is deemed to be proper and is therefore, maintained.

Conclusion

NO claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SATYENDRA K. SINGH whose telephone number is (571)272-8790. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5MF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon P. Weber can be reached on 571-272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Satyendra K. Singh/
Examiner, Art Unit 1657

/Irene Marx/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651